



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/718,218	11/20/2003	Richard D. Dettinger	ROC920030251US1	9017

46797 7590 03/20/2007

IBM CORPORATION, INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW
DEPT 917, BLDG. 006-1
3605 HIGHWAY 52 NORTH
ROCHESTER, MN 55901-7829

EXAMINER

PHAM, KHANH B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2166

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/20/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The amendment filed 1/3/2007 has been entered. Claims 1, 5-6, 9, 13, 17, 20, 24, 25, 28, 36, and 39-41 have been amended. Claim 2 has been canceled. Claims 1, 3-41 are pending in this Office Action.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: line 8, "accordance with **the a** view" should be changed to "accordance with a view". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 18 is objected to because of the following informality: lines 2-3, "in which the initially written" should be changed to "in which the abstract query initially written"

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claim 20-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The claims fail to place the invention squarely within one statutory class of invention.

On page 7, [0029] of the instant specification, applicant has provided evidence that applicant intends the "medium" to include signals such as "wireless communication". As

Art Unit: 2166

such, the claim is drawn to a form of energy. Energy is not one of the four categories of invention and therefore this claim(s) is/are not statutory. Energy is not a series of steps or acts and thus is not a process. Energy is not a physical article or object and as such is not a machine or manufacture. Energy is not a combination of substances and therefor not a composition of matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1, 2-4, 6-8, 10-19, 20-23, 25-27 and 29-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kawakura et al. (US 2004/0034521 A1), hereinafter "**Kawakura**".

As per claim 1, Kawakura teaches a method of providing natural language support for users running queries against a database comprising:

- "providing a data abstract model comprising a plurality of logical fields abstractly describing physical data residing in the database" at [0122] and Figs. 7-16;

- “associating the data abstraction model with a language resource component defining a natural language expression for each of the plurality of logical fields” at [0130] - [0133] and Figs. 6-16;
- “creating an effective data abstraction model by modifying the data abstraction model in accordance with a view that reflects one or more security setting for a group of users” at [0179]-[0181] ;
- “displaying to a user of the group of users, the effective data abstraction model” at [0148]-[0149].

As per claim 3, Kawakura teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising: “creating the language resource component for the data abstraction model, the creating comprising mapping a default value to each logical field of the plurality of logical fields” at [0130]-[0133] and Figs. 7-16.

As per claim 4, Kawakura teaches the method of claim 1, wherein “the associating comprises: generating, in the data abstraction model, a reference to the language resource component to associate the data abstraction model with the language resource component” at Fig. 7.

As per claim 5, teaches the method of claim 4, wherein “the associated language resource component is an XML Localization Interchange File Format resource”

As per claim 6, Kawakura teaches a method of providing natural language support for users running queries against a database comprising:

- “providing a data abstraction model comprising a plurality of logical fields abstractly describing physical data residing in the database” at [0122];
- “providing translation information for the data abstraction model describing translations of each of the plurality of logical fields from a first natural language expression to two or more second natural language expressions” at [0130]-[0133];
- “displaying one of the second natural language expression to a user, wherein which of the two or more second natural language expressions is displayed depends upon which natural language expression files are loaded to define a language resource component associated with the data abstract model” at [0143], [0148]-[0149].

As per claim 7, Kawakura teaches the method of claim 6, wherein “the first and second natural language expressions are two different languages” at [0147].

As per claim 8, Kawakura teaches the method of claim 6, wherein “the first and second natural language expressions are two different variations on the same language” at [0183].

As per claim 9, teaches the method of claim 6, wherein “providing translation information comprises providing XML Localization Interchange File Format resource”

As per claim 10, Kawakura teaches the method of claim 6, wherein “the data abstraction model further comprise a reference to at least a portion of the translation information” at [0181].

As per claim 11, Kawakura teaches the method of claim 10, wherein “the referenced portion is a default file” at [0182].

As per claim 12, Kawakura teaches the method of claim 6, wherein “providing translation information comprises successively loading language resource files, wherein each successive language resource file comprises translations of increasing specificity to replace relatively less specific translations of one or more previously loaded language resource files” at [0209]-[0212].

As per claim 13, Kawakura teaches the method of claim 6, wherein “the translation information further describes translations of each of the plurality of logical fields from the first natural language expression to a third natural language expression, and further comprising: displaying, to a user, at least a portion of the data abstraction model, using only one of the first natural language expression, one of the two or more

Art Unit: 2166

second natural language expression and the third natural language expression" at [0147]-[0148] and Figs. 7-13.

As per claim 14, Kawakura teaches the method of claim 13, wherein "which language expression is used to display the portion of the data abstraction model is based on user parameters" at [0179].

As per claim 15, Kawakura teaches the method of claim 14, wherein "the user parameters describe a context of the user" at [0179].

As per claim 16, Kawakura teaches the method of claim 6, further comprising:

- "retrieving an abstract query expressed in the first natural language expression" at [0125]-[0126];
- "translating the abstract query on the basis of the translation information to express the abstract query in the second natural language expression" at [0129]-[0130];
- "displaying the abstract query expressed in the second natural language expression" at Figs. 7-16.

As per claim 17, Kawakura teaches a method of providing natural language support for users running queries against a database comprising:

Art Unit: 2166

- “retrieving an abstract query comprising a plurality of logical fields, each corresponding to a logical field specification of a data abstraction model abstractly describing physical data residing in the database” at Fig. 7;
- “determining from the data abstraction model, an associated language resource component” at Fig. 7;
- “determining, from the associated language resource component, at least two natural language expressions for the plurality of logical fields of the abstract query” at Fig. 8;
- “displaying the abstract query in one of the at least two determined natural language expression to a user” at Fig. 9;
- “wherein the natural language expression displayed is determined by a security setting of the user” at [0179].

As per claim 18, Kawakura teaches the method of claim 17, further comprising:

“prior to displaying, translating the abstract query from another language expression in which the abstract query initially written” at [0130]-[0131].

As per claim 19, Kawakura teaches the method of claim 17, wherein “the associated language resource component is a language resource file, the data abstraction model including a reference to the language resource file” at Figs. 7-9.

Claims 20-23, 25-27 and 29-41 recite a computer readable medium and computer system for performing similar method as in claims 1, 2-4, 6-8, 10-19 discussed above and are therefore rejected by the same reasons.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. **Claims 5, 9, 24, 28** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawakura as applied to claims above, and in view of Inanoria (US 2004/0046789 A1), hereinafter "inanoria".

As per claims 5, 9, 24 and 28, Kawakura teaches the same as discussed in the rejection of claims 4, 6, 23 and 25 above. Kawakura does not explicitly teach the associated language resource is an "XML Localization Interchange File Format". However, Inanoria teaches the advantage of XML Localization Interchange File Format to facilitate "the ease of use and management for multi-lingual characters specially double-byte characters for Asian languages..." at [0164] Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Kawakura and Inanoria's teaching in order to "facilitate the ease of use and

management for multi-lingual characters” such as Japanese and Chinese as disclosed in Kawakura and Inanoria.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3-41 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Regarding the 35 U.S.C 101 rejection to claims 20-38, applicant argued that the claimed invention are directed to article of manufacture (computer readable medium), which is statutory subject matter. However, on page 7, [0029] of the instant specification, applicant has provided evidence that applicant intends the “medium” to include signals such as “wireless communication”. As such, the claim is drawn to a form of energy. Energy is not one of the four categories of invention and therefore this claim(s) is/are not statutory. Energy is not a series of steps or acts and thus is not a process. Energy is not a physical article or object and as such is not a machine or manufacture. Energy is not a combination of substances and therefor not a composition of matter. The 101 rejection to claims 20-39 are therefore maintained.

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 2166

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Khanh B. Pham whose telephone number is (571) 272-4116. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 7:30am to 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on (571) 272-3978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2166

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Khanh B. Pham
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2166



March 14, 2007